

Serial No. 09/477,910

LARRSON-20-1

REMARKS:

Consideration of the application is respectfully requested. Amendments have been made pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121. No new matter has been entered.

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-22 are pending.

Claims 19-22 are allowed.

Claims 1 and 16-17 are currently amended.

CLAIMS**I. Claim Rejection – 35 USC 112**

In paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph for insufficient antecedent basis for “control means.” In response, the dependency of Claims 16 and 17 has been changed to Claim 2. Claim 2 recites a “control means” and provides the necessary antecedent basis of the term in Claims 16 and 17. In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments to Claims 16 and 17, the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph should be withdrawn.

II. Claim Rejection – 35 USC 103

Rejection under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crochiere et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,664,011) in view of Golla et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,724,395)

In paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-12, 16 and 17 as being unpatentable over Crochiere et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,664,011) in view of Golla et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,724,395). Applicant has amended the claims to better clarify the invention. Claim 1 has been amended to modify the “data partitioning means” to include details in allowed Claim 22 related to the partitioning.

The Examiner acknowledges that Crochiere **does not** teach a second FIR filter and the means to partition the input signal. Thus, Golla et al. was relied upon for a teaching of two FIR filters and partitioning a data word. However, Golla et al. **does not** teach “*a data partitioning means for partitioning a data signal such that a first portion of a partitioned signal is processed by the first FIR filter, and a second portion of the partitioned signal comprised of bits having a data size greater than the bit width of the first FIR filter are processed by the second FIR filter,*” as now claimed.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the new Claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Crochiere et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,664,011) in view of Golla et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,724,395) and the corresponding rejection under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn. Since Claims 2-18 depend from independent Claim 1, then for the same reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 1, these dependent claims are also allowable over the combination of Crochiere et al. in view of Golla et al. and the corresponding rejection under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Serial No. 09/477,910

LARRSON-20-1

**Rejection under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Crochiere et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,664,011) in view of
Golla et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,724,395) and further in view of
Maulik et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,260,053)**

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 13-15 as being unpatentable over Crochiere et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,664,011) in view of Golla et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,724,395) and further in view of Maulik et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,260,053). In response, the Applicant amended Claim 1 to modify the "data partitioning means" to include details in allowed Claim 22 related to the partitioning. Maulik et al. does not teach the details as now claimed in Claim 1. Thus, the rejection of Claim 13-15 under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn.

**Rejection under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Crochiere et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,664,011) in view of
Golla et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,724,395) and further in view of
Walker et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,570,423)**

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 18 as being unpatentable over Crochiere et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,664,011) in view of Golla et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,724,395) and further in view of Walker et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,570,423). In response, the Applicant amended Claim 1 to modify the "data partitioning means" to include details in allowed Claim 22 related to the partitioning. Walker et al. does not teach the details as now claimed in Claim 1. Thus, the rejection of Claim 18 under 35 USC 103(a) should be removed.